

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The applicant acknowledges, with thanks, receipt of the Office Action that was mailed on November 29, 2007, and completion of the telephonic interview of January 28, 2008. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and summarized herein.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, as certain reference characters were not legible, and as they included reference numerals not mentioned in the specification. The applicants have corrected the drawings and specification as suggested, and replacement drawings are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3 and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3 and 13 have been amended to specify a portable data storage device such as to have proper antecedent basis. Claims 12-20 have been amended to specify the claims are directed to the system of claim 11 such as to also have proper antecedent basis. Thus, this rejection should be overcome.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 02(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/007524 to Blair et al. In view of the amendments and arguments set forth, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

By way of review, the subject application is directed to a system and method for processing a document from a portable data storage device. A portable data storage device is received into a document rendering device, wherein the portable data storage device inclusive of at least one electronic document stored in a native application format from which it was generated. Administrative data representative of document processing privilege is received and a document service associated with the document rendering device is activated in accordance with such received data upon insertion of the portable data storage device. A user is prompted as to document processing options associated with the portable data storage device and the user selects at least one selected document processing option to be performed on the at least one file. A native application format of the at least one electronic document is tested relative to capabilities of the associated document rendering device and a display corresponding to available document processing operations available on the at least one electronic document is generated in accordance with an output of the testing. Operation of the associated document rendering device is then commenced in accordance with received user input and available document processing operations.

Blair is directed to an image management system wherein image data is acquired from several different sources, including removable media. Blair is further directed to submission of electronic image data processing vendors for rendering. Unlike Blair, the subject application is directed to receiving electronic images in various formats to a device which has constraints relative to processing options, which constraints are contingent on capabilities of the device or file formats for incoming data. By way of example, if an e-mail operation is desired, virtually any incoming document type is acceptable as the document is attached to an e-mail for forwarding. Other document types may be in a format such as character based or bitmapped. These documents can be handled, depending on the file format relative to the capabilities of the device. In such instances, a user is presented with document processing options that vary depending on such format and device capability. Thus, a user is provided with various document processing alternatives which are contingent on form and device capabilities.

Amendment to independent claims 1 and 11 has been made in view of the afore-noted discussions. As amended, all claims include limitations wherein an electronic document format is tested against device capabilities, and a user is provided processing operation in accordance with such testing. It is respectfully submitted that, as amended, all claims are patentably distinct over the art of record and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/31282.

Date: 1-29-08

Respectfully submitted,



Susan L. Mizer  
Registration No. 38,245  
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
1150 Huntington Bldg.  
925 Euclid Ave.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414  
**Customer No.: 23380**  
Tel.: (216) 696-3466  
Fax: (216) 592-5009